	1	LAWRENCE A. MICHAELS (SBN 107260), la VERONICA VON GRABOW (SBN 259859), v MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP	
		11377 West Olympic Boulevard Los Angeles, California 90064-1683	REC'D
	3	Telephone: (310) 312-2000 Facsimile: (310) 312-3100	MAR 26 2012
	4	LINDA MILLER SAVITT (SBN 094164)	FILING WINDOW
	5	BALLARD, ROSENBERG, GOLPER & SAVI 500 North Brand Boulevard, Twentieth Floor	TT LLP
		Glendale, California 91203-9946 Telephone: (818) 508-3700	
	6	Facsimile: (818) 506-4827	
	7	CAROL A. HUMISTON (SBN 115592) SENIOR ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY–CIT	TV OF BURRANK
	8	275 East Olive Avenue Burbank, California 91510	TOT BORDANK
	9	Telephone: (818) 238-5707	
	9	Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Complainant CI	ΓΥ OF BURBANK, including the
1	0	POLICE DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY OF BURE independent entity named "BURBANK POLICE DE	
1	1		
1	12		HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
j	. 2	FOR THE COUNT	Y OF LOS ANGELES
1	13	OMAR RODRIGUEZ; CINDY KARAGIOSIAN-GOMEZ; STEVE	Case No. BC 414602
1	14	KARAGIOSIAN; ELFEGÓ RODRIGUEZ; AND JAMAL CHILDS, Plaintiffs,	Location: 37 Judge: The Honorable Joanne O'Donnell
1	15	v. BURBANK POLICE DEPARTMENT; CITY	DEFENDANT CITY OF BURBANK'S REVISED [PROPOSED] SPECIAL
1	16	OF BURBANK; AND DOES 1 THROUGH 100, INCLUSIVE, Defendants.	VERDICT FORM RE: PLAINTIFF KARAGIOSIAN
1	17	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS	File Date: May 28, 2009
1	18	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS	Trial Date: March 19, 2012 (Karagiosian)
	19		Discovery Referee: Hon. Diane Wayne, Ret.
•	19		
2	20		
2	21		
2	22		
Mitchell			
Knupp LLP	23		VERDICT FORM BE, DI ADVITIEF IVARACIOGIANI
		DUNDAINA S KEVISED [PROPOSED] SPECIAL	VERDICT FORM RE: PLAINTIFF KARAGIOSIAN

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

2	Defendant CITY OF BURBANK	hereby submits the following revised proposed special
3	verdict, which is CACI VF-2506A modifi	ed to apply to the facts and causes of action in this case.
4		
5	Dated: March 25, 2012	MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP Lawrence A. Michaels
6		Veronica T. von Grabow
7		By: Veronica T. von Grabow
8		Attorneys for Defendants and Cross-Complainant CITY OF BURBANK including the POLICE DEPARTMENT OF BURBANK (erroneously sued as an independent entity named "BURBANK POLICE DEPARTMENT")
9		THE CITY OF BURBANK (erroneously sued as an independent entity named "BURBANK POLICE DEBARTMENT")
10		BURDAINE FOLICE DEPARTMENT
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22	·	

Mitchell Silberberg & 23

410135.1

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF TI	HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	FOR THE COUNT	Y OF LOS ANGELES
10	STEVE KARAGIOSIAN,	Case No. BC 414602
11	Plaintiff, v.	SPECIAL VERDICT
12	BURBANK POLICE DEPARTMENT; CITY OF BURBANK; AND DOES 1 THROUGH	Trial Date: March 19, 2012
13	100, INCLUSIVE,	
14	Defendants.	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23	410135.1	1

We, the jury in the above-entitled action, find the following special verdict on the issues 1 submitted to us as to the claims brought by Plaintiff STEVE KARAGIOSIAN against Defendant 2 CITY OF BURBANK: 3 **Hostile Work Environment** 4 5 1. Was Mr. Karagiosian subjected to unwanted harassing conduct because he is Armenian on or after May 27, 2008? 6 Yes No 7 If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer question 2. If you answered no, 8 stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form. 9 2. Was Mr. Karagiosian also subjected to unwanted harassing conduct because he is 10 Armenian before May 27 2008, which conduct was all of the following: (a) similar in kind to the conduct occurring on or after May 27, 2008; (b) occurred with reasonable frequency; and (c) had not stopped (or become permanent)? 11 12 Yes No 13 Answer question 3. 14 3. Was the harassing conduct which you found to exist in response to questions 1 and 15 2 severe or pervasive? 16 Yes No 17 If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date 18 this form. 19 4. Would a reasonable person in Mr. Karagiosian's circumstances have considered the work environment to be hostile or abusive? 20 21 Yes No 22 23 2 410135.1

1		If your answer to question 4 is yes, then answer question 5. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date
2		this form.
3	5.	Did Mr. Karagiosian consider the work environment to be hostile or abusive?
4		Yes No
5		If your answer to question 5 is yes, then answer question 6. If you answered no,
6		stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
7	6.	Did Burbank know or should it have known of the harassing conduct?
8		Yes No
9		105
10		If your answer to question 6 is yes, then answer question 7. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
11		tills form.
12	7.	Did Burbank fail to take immediate and appropriate corrective action?
13		Yes No
14 15		If your answer to question 7 is yes, then answer question 8. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
16	8.	Did Mr. Karagiosian prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the harassing
17		conduct was a substantial factor in causing harm to him?
18		Yes No
19	,	If your answer to question 8 is yes, then answer question 9. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date
20		this form.
21		
22		
23	410135.1	3
	1	

Failure To Prevent Hostile Work Environment

2		NOTE: Answer question 9 only if you answered yes to question 8.
3		
4	9.	Did Mr. Karagiosian prove that Burbank failed to take reasonable steps to prevent harassment from occurring?
5		YesNo
6		If your answer to question 9 is yes, then move to question 10. If you answered no,
7		then move to question 10 if you answered yes to question 8. Otherwise, stop here, answer no further questions and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
8		<u>Damages</u>
9	10.	What are Mr. Karagiosian's damages?
10		What are was starting to daming out
11		\$
12	11.	Did Burbank prove Mr. Karagiosian could have avoided some or all of his damages if he had used Burbank's harassment complaint procedures?
13		YesNo
14		
15		If your answer to question 11 is yes, then answer question 12. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
16		
17	12.	What amount of damages could Mr. Karagiosian have avoided if he had used Burbank's harassment complaint procedures?
18		\$
19		
20	Please sign	n and date this form.
21		
22	Signed: _	Dated:
		Presiding Juror
23	410135.1	4

1 PROOF OF SERVICE 2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 3 I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. 4 I am over the age of 18, and not a party to the within action; my business address is , . 5 On March 26, 2012, I served the foregoing document(s) described as **DEFENDANT** CITY OF BURBANK'S REVISED (PROPOSED) SPECIAL VERDICT FORM RE: 6 PLAINTIFF KARAGIOSIAN which was enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as follows. and taking the action described below: 7 Solomon E. Gresen, Esq., seg@rglawyers.com Steven V. Rheuban, Esq., svr@rglawyers.com 8 Law Offices of Rheuban & Gresen 9 Los Angeles County Superior Court 111 North Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Omar Rodriguez, Cindy Guillen-Gomez, Steve Karagiosian, Elfego 11 Rodriguez, and Jamal Childs 12 13 **BY PERSONAL SERVICE:** I hand delivered such envelope(s): 14 \boxtimes to the addressee(s); 15 to the receptionist/clerk/secretary in the office(s) of the addressee(s). 16 by leaving the envelope in a conspicuous place at the office of the addressee(s) between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. 17 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is 18 true and correct. 19 Executed on March 26, 2012, at Los Angeles, California. 20 Veronica von Grabow 21 Printed Name Signature 22 23 24

Mitchell 28 Silberberg & Knupp LLP

4528346.1

25

26

27